arXiv:1611.09542v2 [q-bio.QM] 11 Jan 2017

Time Dependent Saddle Node Bifurcation: Breaking Time and the Point of No Return in a Non-Autonomous Model of Critical Transitions

Jeremiah H. Li[1], Felix X.-F. Ye[1], Hong Qian[1], and Sui Huang[2]

[1]Department of Applied Mathematics
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3925, USA

[2]Institute for Systems Biology
Seattle, WA 98109, USA

January 12, 2017

Abstract

There is a growing awareness that catastrophic natural phenomena can be mathematically represented in terms of saddle-node bifurcations. In particular, the term "tipping point" has in recent years entered the discourse of the general public in relation to ecology, medicine, and public health. The mathematical theory of saddle-node bifurcation and its associated topological theory of catastrophe as put forth by Thom and Zeeman has seen application in a wide range of fields including molecular biophysics, mesoscopic physics, and climate science. In this paper, we investigate a simple model of a non-autonomous system with a time dependent parameter $p(\tau)$ and its corresponding "dynamic" (time-dependent) saddle-node bifurcation. We show that the actual point of no return for a system undergoing tipping can be significantly delayed in comparison to the *breaking time* $\hat{\tau}$ at which the corresponding autonomous system with a time-independent parameter $p_a = p(\hat{\tau})$ undergoes a bifurcation. A dimensionless parameter

$\alpha = \lambda p_0^3 V^{-2}$ is introduced, in which λ is the curvature of the autonomous saddle-node bifurcation according to parameter $p(\tau)$, which has an initial value of p_0 and a constant rate of change V. We find that the breaking time $\hat{\tau}$ is always less than the actual point of no return τ^* after which the critical transition is irreversible; specifically, the relation $\tau^* - \hat{\tau} \simeq 2.338(\lambda V)^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ is analytically obtained. For a system with a small λV, there exists a significant window of opportunity $(\hat{\tau}, \tau^*)$ during which rapid reversal of the environment can save the system from catastrophe.

1 Introduction

The concepts of attractors and bifurcations from the mathematical theory of nonlinear dynamics [1, 2] have been essential in understanding biological systems in mechanistic terms [3], with particular relevance in fields such as cellular biochemistry [4], developmental biology [5], and cancer medicine [6]. The most commonly encountered one-dimensional bifurcations are of the saddle-node (fold), transcritical, and pitchfork types [1, 2]. There is, however, an essential difference in structural stability between the latter two types and the first; to wit, recall that the canonical forms for the latter two types of bifurcations are given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(\lambda - x) \qquad \text{transcritical bifurcation} \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(\lambda - x^2) \qquad \text{pitchfork bifurcation} \tag{2}$$

where x is the state variable and λ is the bifurcation parameter. It is easy to verify that these systems are structurally unstable [2]: For the transcritical case, the two fixed points of $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(\lambda - x) + \epsilon$ will never collide when $\epsilon > 0$. For the pitchfork case, by employing the triple-root condition for a cubic equation we see that if $\epsilon \neq 0$, $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(\lambda - x^2) - \epsilon(x^2 - 1)$ will no longer have a pitchfork bifurcation, but only one of the saddle-node type [7]. In mathematical terms, both phenomena are not structurally stable; in biological terms, they are not robust. On the other hand, it is well known that saddle-node bifurcations *are* structurally stable, and are thus a more robust nonlinear phenomenon [8][1]. It is for precisely this reason that saddle-node bifurcations, and the associated cusp catastrophe, play an important role in biology. Indeed, they have afforded fundamental insights and

[1]Note that robust pitchfork bifurcations can exist if defined in particular ways, such as the type defined via the "hidden" second-order phase transition associated with any cusp catastrophe [9].

conceptual understanding of a wide range of biological phenomena, from voltage-dependent channel kinetics and forced macromolecular bond rupture [10], to *E. coli* phenotype switching [11] and ecological insect outbreak [12].

More recently, there has been intense interest in using a dynamical systems approach to the characterization of a class of phenomenon known as "critical transitions" or "tipping points" [13], where complex systems experience a qualitatively large and abrupt change very rapidly (in comparison to normal dynamics)—for example, a critical transition of a financial market might be a financial crisis; or, in an ecosystem, a critical transition might be rapid desertification [14, 15]. The generic nature of this class of phenomena means that it has broad applications; indeed, the literature on "tipping point" phenomena spans a wide variety of fields, including cancer biology [16, 17], quick-onset disease theory [18], ecology [19], environmental and climate science [20, 15], and sociology [21].

Mathematically, systems with tipping points can be represented as dynamical systems with saddle-node bifurcations, where the tipping points are the corresponding fold catastrophes. However, it is critical to understand that in real-world systems, the bifurcation parameter of a dynamical system can itself be *time-dependent*; thus, tipping points are fold catastrophes *induced* by parameters changing in time. In other words, tipping points are induced by changes in external conditions, and systems with tipping points are described by non-autonomous dynamical systems. To be more mathematically precise, these systems can in general be described by a non-autonomous dynamical system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\vec{x}}{\mathrm{d}t} = \vec{f}(\vec{x}, p(t)) \tag{3}$$

such that:

- If $p(t)$ is a constant, the vector field $\vec{f}(\vec{x}, p)$ has (for some value $\hat{p}$) an attractor for $p < \hat{p}$ which loses stability for $p > \hat{p}$.
- If $p(t)$ depends on t, we have $p(t)$ such that: (*i*) at $t = \hat{t}$, $p(\hat{t}) = \hat{p}$, (*ii*) $p(t) < \hat{p}$ when $t < \hat{t}$, and (*iii*) $p(t) > \hat{p}$ when $t > \hat{t}$.

When the parameters change slowly enough, the system can be approximated as its autonomous counterpart (that is, where p is the time-independent bifurcation parameter), or as a slow-fast system [14]. However, cases where such approximations are not valid require treatments of the fully non-autonomous system, of which there are fewer [22].

The purpose of the present paper is to present a non-autonomous treatment of a simple system with a tipping point. We do this by introducing an explicitly time-dependent mathematical model for systems with a generic tipping point. In particular, we introduce the concepts of a system's "breaking time" and "point of no return" alongside the well developed modern mathematical notion of "pullback attractors". Most notably, we discuss how a non-autonomous treatment of tipping point phenomena reveals possibilities for saving systems which autonomous treatments would deem as having already undergone an irreversible transition. To wit: consider the system described in Eq. 3: in the autonomous limit where the constant parameter p is varied at an infinitely slow speed, the system undergoes a critical transition precisely at the moment when p crosses $\hat{p}$. However, we show that a non-autonomous treatment reveals that if the parameter begins at $p < \hat{p}$ and increases at a constant rate V to lead to a disappearance of a stable steady state at $t = \hat{t}$ (which we call the "breaking time"), the system can be rescued if a rapid reversal of the environment is effected, *even for* $t > \hat{t}$. However, there is only a finite window of opportunity: a "point of no return" $t^* > \hat{t}$ exists, after which the system cannot be saved. This window of opportunity $(\hat{t}, t^*)$ therefore has potential for great practical significance in managing tipping point phenomena. We obtain a result for the relationship between these two quantities based on the analytic solution for the pullback attractor of our simple model (Eq. 20 below): $t^* - \hat{t} \simeq 2.338(\lambda V)^{-1/3}$, where λ is the curvature of the autonomous saddle-node bifurcation according to parameter p.

The paper is structured as follows. In Sec. 2, we give a brief introduction to non-autonomous systems and the notion of pullback attractors, followed by several simple examples to illustrate the dynamics of non-autonomous systems with: (*i*) a "moving fixed point", (*ii*) a moving fixed point with a changing eigenvalue, and (*iii*) a more complex situation with a "hidden catastrophe". This section is included purely for pedagogical purposes. Motivated readers are also referred to a more mathematical discussion [23, 24]. Sec. 3 introduces the main model for the dynamic saddle-node bifurcation (Eq. 20). We explore its behavior using numerical computation. The notions of $\hat{t}$ and t^* are defined, and a relation between them is observed from numerical computations. We then present the analytical solution of the model in terms of the first Airy function, from which we obtain an exact relation between $\hat{t}$ and t^*. The paper concludes with Sec. 4 which discusses our model and the concepts of breaking time and the point of no return; also, we relate the concepts to the notion of "bifurcation-induced tipping" (*B-tipping*) in the context of climate science.

2 Simple non-autonomous dynamics and pullback attractors

2.1 Pullback attractors and tipping point phenomena

An autonomous dynamical system described by the system of ordinary differential equations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\vec{x}(t) = \vec{f}\big(\vec{x}(t), p\big) \qquad \vec{x}, \vec{f}(\vec{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{4}$$

has an n-dimensional vector field $\vec{f}(\vec{x}, p)$ that is independent of time. In the theory of dynamical systems of this form, the concept of attractors is among the most important—they characterize the long-time behavior of a system [1, 2, 7]. In the context of tipping point phenomena modeled by autonomous systems with saddle node bifurcations, a system always tracks the stable equilibrium point as the parameter is slowly increased, until the the fold catastrophe, at which point the system undergoes a "critical transition" (that is, it "tips") into another attractor.

For non-autonomous dynamical systems, however, which are described by a system of ordinary differential equations

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\vec{x}(t) = \vec{f}\big(\vec{x}(t), p(t)\big) = \vec{g}(\vec{x}(t), t) \qquad \vec{x}, \vec{g}(\vec{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R} \tag{5}$$

the vector field $\vec{g}$ is *itself* an explicit function of time—in physical terms, the changing vector field reflects the changing environment of the system. Because of this, a system starting in a particular initial state $\vec{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$ where $\vec{g}(\vec{x}^*, t) = 0$ when $t = t_0$ will in general not remain at $\vec{x}^*$ for all future times $t = t_1 > t_0$—contrast this to equilibrium points in autonomous systems, where trajectories starting there remain there for all future time.

Thus, the idea of attractors from autonomous theory is insufficient to describe non-autonomous systems (and therefore general tipping phenomena)—the concepts must be generalized—which is where the concept of a "pullback attractor" comes in [23]. Note the fact that the solutions to non-autonomous systems explicitly depend *not only* on the elapsed time $t-t_0$ but on *both* t and t_0. The dependence on two variables thus means there are two types of attractors for non-autonomous systems—in fact, it means that attractors in non-autonomous systems involve a time-dependence, unlike attractors in autonomous systems [24]. Also, the mathematical theory of non-autonomous dynamics has established that attraction of the

"pullback" type is of a more fundamental character. Indeed, an autonomous system's attractors are the same as their pullback attractors—they are only different for non-autonomous systems.

Qualitatively, a pullback attractor of a non-autonomous system can be thought of as the attractor for a large collection of trajectories which began infinitely long ago; quantitatively, it corresponds with the trajectory of the system with an initial condition $(t_0, \vec{x}_0)$ in the case when $t_0 \to -\infty$. To be more mathematically precise: let $\vec{\varphi}(t \mid \vec{x}_0, t_0)$ be the solution to Eq. 5 with an initial condition $\vec{x}(t_0) = \vec{x}_0$. Then the pullback attractor of the system is given by $\vec{\varphi}_{pb}(t)$:[2]

$$\vec{\varphi}_{pb}(t) \equiv \lim_{t_0 \to -\infty} \vec{\varphi}(t \mid \vec{x}_0, t_0) \tag{6}$$

Note that the pullback attractor is independent of x_0—in essence, it is the trajectory a system will take after enough time has elapsed for the "memory" of the starting state $\vec{x}_0$ to be lost. For systems which start sometime in the finite past, they quickly converge to $\vec{\varphi}_{pb}(t)$, as illustrated in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2.

What follows are several simple examples.

2.2 A moving fixed point

The first example is of a non-autonomous dynamical system with a single fixed point whose location changes smoothly in time; that is, $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\lambda(x - \tilde{x}(t))$ where $\tilde{x}(t)$ is the location of the fixed point. The exact solution to this non-autonomous ODE is

$$\varphi(t \mid x_0, t_0) = x_0 e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)} + \lambda \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{-\lambda(t-\tau)} \tilde{x}(\tau)\, \mathrm{d}\tau \tag{7}$$

$$= (x_0 - \tilde{x}(t_0))\, e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)} + \tilde{x}(t) - \int_0^{t-t_0} e^{-\lambda s} \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{x}(t-s)}{\mathrm{d}t} \right) \mathrm{d}s. \tag{8}$$

We obtain the pullback attractor by taking $t_0 \to -\infty$:

$$\varphi_{pb}(t) = \lambda \int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{-\lambda(t-\tau)} \tilde{x}(\tau)\, \mathrm{d}\tau = \lambda \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\lambda s} \tilde{x}(t-s)\, \mathrm{d}s. \tag{9}$$

[2] Actually, an even more mathematically precise statement is that the limit of $\vec{\varphi}(t|B, t_0)$ as $t_0 \to -\infty$ for any subset $B \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, is itself a set. In this paper we only consider *point attractors*: then we just have the simple Eq. 6.

It is instructive to note that $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ differs from the function one obtains if one takes $t \to \infty$ in Eq. 7:

$$\varphi_f(t_0) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \lambda e^{-\lambda t} \int_{t_0}^{t} e^{\lambda\tau} \tilde{x}(\tau)\, \mathrm{d}\tau = \lim_{\tau\to\infty} \lambda \int_{0}^{\tau} e^{-\lambda s} \tilde{x}(\tau + t_0 - s)\, \mathrm{d}s. \quad (10)$$

$\varphi_f(t_0)$ is called the *forward attractor* [23]. If $\tilde{x}(t) \equiv \tilde{x}_0$ is independent of t, then both Eqs. 9 and 10 are equal to the same constant $\tilde{x}_0$. If $\tilde{x}(t)$ has limits $\tilde{x}_{\pm\infty}$ when t tends to $\pm\infty$, then $\varphi_f(t_0) = \tilde{x}_{+\infty}$, but $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ is a smooth function of t that connects $\tilde{x}_{-\infty}$ to $\tilde{x}_{+\infty}$ [24]. In general, however, it is not certain that the limit in Eq. 10 always exists, although the pullback attractor *itself* always exists.

The plots in Fig. 1 also illustrate that $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ is a more appropriate characterization of the "long-time limiting behavior" than $\varphi_f(t_0)$: namely, for a system with some initial condition, the latter tells us only about its behavior in the infinite future. In order to observe the long-term behavior of the system without going into the infinite future, one has to instead start the system in the infinite past.

If λ is very large, the relaxation toward $\tilde{x}(t)$ occurs on a much faster timescale than the dynamics of the moving fixed point $\tilde{x}(t)$ itself. In this case, Eq. 9 becomes $\varphi_{pb}(t; \lambda) \simeq \tilde{x}(t)$.

Figs. 1A and 1B illustrate two examples of $\tilde{x}(t)$: a linear case, $\tilde{x}(t) = -vt$, and a nonlinear case: $\tilde{x}(t) = \mu(-t)^{1/2}$, where $t \leq 0$. The corresponding solutions are

$$\varphi^{\text{lin}}(t \mid x_0, t_0) = (x_0 + vt)e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)} + \tilde{x}(t) + \frac{v}{\lambda}\left[1 - e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)}\right], \quad (11)$$

$$\varphi^{\text{nonl}}(t \mid x_0, t_0) = \left(x_0 - \mu\sqrt{-t_0}\right) e^{-\lambda(t-t_0)} + \tilde{x}(t) + \mu e^{-\lambda t} \int_{|t|}^{|t_0|} e^{-\lambda\tau}\, \mathrm{d}\sqrt{\tau}. \quad (12)$$

In both cases, $x(t) \simeq \tilde{x}(t) + C$ for large $(t - t_0)$, where C is a positive constant. For the linear case, $C = v\lambda^{-1}$; for the nonlinear case, $C \simeq (\mu/2)\sqrt{\pi/\lambda}$, the last term in Eq. 12. We conclude that for a system with a moving fixed point, the long-term dynamics follows the fixed point $\tilde{x}(t)$ plus a constant, represented by the last term in Eq. 8, which is the displacement of $\tilde{x}(t)$ within the characteristic time λ^{-1}.

To briefly summarize, there are three key features of a pullback attractor: it always exists, it is unique, and it is a close counterpart of the corresponding autonomous ODE attractor under a small perturbation. It is also important to keep in mind, that a pullback attractor needs not be a single curve of t (called a point



Figure 1: Trajectories and pullback attractors of various non-autonomous ODEs described in Secs. 2.1 and 2.2. (A) Moving fixed point with $\tilde{x}(t) = -vt$ according to Eqs. (8) and (9); $v = 1$, $\lambda = 1$, $x_0 = 1$ and several initial times t_0. (B) Moving fixed point with $\tilde{x}(t) = \mu(-t)^{1/2}$, $t \leq 0$; $\mu = 1$, $\lambda = 1$, $x_0 = 1$ and several initial times t_0. (C) Moving fixed point with changing eigenvalue according to (13), with $\tilde{x}(t) = \frac{1}{2}r'(t) = v(-t)^{1/2}$, $t \leq 0$; $v = 1$, $x_0 = 1$, and several initial times t_0.

attractor). It can be an entire interval. One such example is $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(t - x)$, the pullback attractor of which is the set of $t < x < 0$ for $t \leq 0$ and $0 < x < t$ for $t \geq 0$.

2.3 Moving fixed point that vanishes with vanishing eigenvalue

Now let us consider a situation in which the eigenvalue at the moving fixed point is also changing with time: $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = -r'(t)(x - \tilde{x}(t))$ with $r(0) = 0$. The solution to this is

$$x(t) = (x(0) - \tilde{x}(0))\, e^{-r(t)} + \tilde{x}(t) - e^{-r(t)} \int_0^t e^{r(\tau)}\, \mathrm{d}\tilde{x}(\tau). \tag{13}$$

The first term disappears if we let $x(0) = \tilde{x}(0)$. Figure 1C shows an example in which we take $\tilde{x}(t) = \frac{1}{2}r'(t) = v(-t)^{1/2}$. In this case,

$$x(t) = (v\hat{t})e^{-r(t)} + 2(v\hat{t})^2 e^{-r(t)} \int_0^{t/\hat{t}} e^{r(s\hat{t})}(1 - s)\, \mathrm{d}s. \tag{14}$$

and $r(t) = \frac{4v}{3}(-t)^{3/2}$ becomes imaginary when $t > \hat{t}$. The fixed point vanishes at $t = 0$ at the same time when the eigenvalue becomes zero. This is the breaking time in the dynamic saddle-node bifurcation (see below).

2.4 System with a "hidden catastrophe"

What happens if the vector field $g(x, t)$ of a non-autonomous system $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = g(x, t)$ has multiple roots for a certain range of t? The pullback attractor in this case resembles the bifurcation diagram of an autonomous system $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = g(x, \lambda)$ with a fold catastrophe: namely, it connects the root of $g(x, t)$ when $t \to -\infty$ with the root of $g(x, t)$ when $t \to +\infty$. Fig. 2 shows the pullback attractor of an example system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(1 - x^2) + t, \tag{15}$$

along with several sample trajectories for several initial conditions. The curve $x(1 - x^2) + t = 0$ is also plotted to illustrate how the pullback attractor tracks the autonomous bifurcation diagram for $t \to \pm\infty$.

2.5 Saddle-node ghosts and bottlenecking

After the "breaking time" at which a stable fixed point (a node) and an unstable fixed point (a saddle) collide, a dynamical system exhibits "bottlenecking" caused by "saddle-node ghosts" in an autonomous ODE. In fact, it is a general feature of systems with saddle-node bifurcations: for example, in Figs. 2A and 2B, which depict Eq. 15, it can be observed near $x = -1$ when $t > 0$. This behavior is due to the fact that systems near a saddle-node bifurcation canonically behave like

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = -x^2 - a^2. \tag{16}$$

For systems of this type, the trajectory of the dynamics is slowed down or "bottlenecked" by a "saddle node ghost" [1, 25]. This is represented in Eq. 16 by a small but positive value of a^2.

Since $a^2 \geq 0$, Eq. 16 has no fixed points — all trajectories starting with $x < 0$ will pass the $x = 0$ and continue to go to $-\infty$. The effect of the saddle node ghost is to make the amount of time it takes for them to pass the $x = 0$ critically dependent upon the value of a. If we set $x(0) = x_0$, the amount time t_b it takes



Figure 2: The pullback attractor $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ of $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = x(1-x^2)+t$ as the bold solid line, along with various trajectories and the bifurcation diagram of the underlying autonomous system (dashed line). Note how $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ does not jump at $t = 0$, but rather changes smoothly to connect the two roots. (A) Trajectories with $x_0 = -3$ for several different t_0. The bifurcation diagram of the underlying autonomous system is $t = -x(1-x^2)$. (B) Trajectories with $x_0 = 3$ for several different t_0.

for the system to go from x_0 to $x(t)$ is found by

$$\int_{x_0}^{x(t)} \frac{1}{-s^2 - a^2}\,\mathrm{d}s = \int_0^t \mathrm{d}t \tag{17}$$

$$\implies t = \frac{1}{a}\left[\arctan\left(\frac{x_0}{a}\right) - \arctan\left(\frac{x(t)}{a}\right)\right], \tag{18}$$

and taking $x(t) \to -\infty$, we get

$$t_b \equiv \lim_{x(t)\to-\infty} t = \frac{1}{a}\left[\arctan\left(\frac{x_0}{a}\right) + \frac{\pi}{2}\right]. \tag{19}$$

Near a saddle-node bifurcation, where a is small, t_b can get to be quite significant: what this means is that even if you start a trajectory of a system that has no fixed points at $t = 0$, it takes a nonzero amount of time to pass a bottleneck, and then takes nearly no time to blow up. We shall later identify a similar blow-up time in our non-autonomous system.

3 Dynamic saddle-node bifurcation

Tipping point phenomena are particularly well-represented by one-dimensional dynamical systems with saddle-node bifurcations due to their structural stability and robustness. In the context of non-autonomous dynamics, the problems deal with a moving fixed point which can also change its character (*e.g.*, eigenvalue), as well as disappear altogether. In Sec. 2, we established simple descriptions of three different mathematical phenomena: (*i*) relaxation of trajectories towards a moving stable fixed point; (*ii*) relaxation of trajectories towards a moving stable fixed point with vanishing eigenvalue; (*iii*) the effect of a saddle-node ghost on trajectories (Fig. 2, where trajectories do not immediately jump to the other branch). We shall now focus on a simple non-autonomous equation that exhibits these three types of behavior, as well as the time-dependent equivalent of a saddle-node bifurcation—we shall say that such a system exhibits a *dynamic saddle-node bifurcation*.

3.1 Model for a dynamic saddle-node bifurcation

We now introduce a non-autonomous dynamical system with a dynamic saddle-node bifurcation. Consider the differential equation for a generic saddle-node



Figure 3: (A) Plot of $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ and trajectories with $\alpha = 4$, $x_0 = 10$, and $x_0 = 4$ for several different t_0. The corresponding "autonomous bifurcation diagram" is also plotted in think dashed line: $x^2 = \alpha(1-t)$. (B) Plot of the pullback attractor $\varphi_{pb}(t)$ for different values of α. Note how t^* increases with α—this corresponds with larger values of p_0 or smaller values of V in the original equation (20). Thin dashed lines are again the corresponding "autonomous bifurcation diagrams".

bifurcation dynamical system in the case when the bifurcation parameter p is an explicit linear function of time: $p(\tau) = p_0 - V\tau$ where $p_0, V > 0$, so that we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}X}{\mathrm{d}\tau} = -\lambda X^2 + (p_0 - V\tau), \tag{20}$$

where V is the "speed" with which the parameter is changing. One can introduce transformed variables x and t alongside the corresponding parameter α:

$$x = \frac{\lambda p_0 X}{V}, \quad t = \frac{V\tau}{p_0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \lambda p_0^3 V^{-2}. \tag{21}$$

Then we arrive at a "non-dimensionalized" version of Eq. 20

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -x^2 + \alpha(1-t). \tag{22}$$

Denoting the right-hand-side of Eq. 22 as $f(x,t) \equiv -x^2+\alpha(1-t)$, it is easy to see that for any $t < 1$, the vector field $f(x,t)$ has two roots—at $x_+(t) = \sqrt{\alpha(1-t)}$ and $x_-(t) = -\sqrt{\alpha(1-t)}$. These two roots approach each other as t increases, and annihilate at $\hat{t} = 1$, and for all $t > 1$, $f(x,t)$ is always negative: all trajectories eventually go to $-\infty$.

Fig. 3 shows several solutions to Eq. 22 as well as the bifurcation diagram for the corresponding autonomous system. Different initial conditions converge to a single "master curve" — this phenomenon is called *forward attraction* [26]. Here we pause to note that the trajectories of these dynamics describes systems with tipping points—they follow a stable equilibrum until a sudden and abrupt transition into a state very different from the original because of some change in its surrounding environment; this is caused by the sudden disappearance of the stable fixed point in $f(x,t)$ at $t = \hat{t}$. We shall call $\hat{t}$ the *breaking time*.

However, it is important to note that while its environment has already fundamentally changed, a dynamical system does not have an immediate drastic response at exactly the time $\hat{t}$, when $f(x,t)$ goes from having two fixed points (for $t < \hat{t}$) to none (for $t > \hat{t}$). Rather, there is a delay as the system traverses the bottleneck caused by the saddle-node ghost present in $f(x,t)$, until it finally reaches $-\infty$ at a time $t^* > \hat{t}$ (see Fig. 3A): we shall call this time the "point of no return"—this choice of naming will become clearer shortly. In the case of an infinitely-slowly changing parameter, the autonomous case from Eq. 19 is recovered: $t^* - \hat{t} = t_b$.

Fig. 3 clearly shows that the time interval between the breaking time and point of no return (*i.e.,* $(\hat{t}, t^*)$) for a system can be quantified in terms of the system's

pullback attractor. Indeed, since tipping point problems are concerned with systems which have in the past followed a stable equilibrium, their dynamics are suitably captured by the pullback attractor of the system.

An analytical solution can be found for Eq. 22, as we show in Sec. 3.3. What makes a non-autonomous treatment of such systems useful compared to the standard, autonomous models, is that it allows an assessment of the point of no return for a system with parameters that change on a similar time scale to the phase space dynamics. On the other hand, an autonomous treatment can provide only provide useful values of t^* for systems where the parameter evolves on a timescale slow enough to be considered decoupled from the dynamics.

Note that trajectories that followed the stable equilibrium in the past behave exactly as the pullback attractor, and experience the same difference between $\hat{t}$ and t^*—it is precisely this fact that makes the pullback attractor so vital in the study of tipping point phenomena, since systems which have not yet tipped are assumed to have been following some equilibrium in the past. Fig. 3B illustrates the dependence of t^* as determined by $\varphi_{pb}(t;\alpha)$ on α; or, in the untransformed variables, the dependence on the velocity V and starting value p_0 of the parameter.

3.2 Delayed catastrophe and the point of no return

Fig. 3B illustrates the relationship between the breaking time $\hat{t}$ and the point of no return t^*; namely, that it is always true that $t^* > \hat{t} = (p_0/V)$. Thus we see that the critical transition is delayed due to the system being bottlenecked, and that this bottlenecking depends on α.

Fig. 4 shows a log-log plot for the system with $\hat{t} = 1$ and several values of α. Note that the speed with which the parameter is changing (V), and the initial "distance" from the bifurcation (p_0), contribute to α differently: $\alpha \sim p_0^3 V^{-2}$. Furthermore, note the difference in behavior for the regimes $\alpha > 1$ and $\alpha < 1$.

3.3 Analytical solution in terms of Airy functions

Eq. 22,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} = -x^2 + \alpha(1-z), \tag{23}$$

is a Riccati equation, $\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = a_0(t) + a_1(t)x + a_2(t)x^2$, with $a_2(t) = -1$, $a_1(t) = 0$, and $a_0 = \alpha(1-t)$. According to the standard method of attack, this 1st order nonlinear ODE can be transformed into a 2nd order linear ODE via $x = \frac{1}{u}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}u}{\mathrm{d}t}\right)$ so



Figure 4: The time of the point of no return, t^*, as a function of α, in a log-log plot, according to Eq. 22. The points are obtained from numerical solutions to the differential equation, e.g., from Fig. 3B. There are two distinct regimes with $\alpha < 1$ and $\alpha > 1$. The thin solid curve $t^* = 1 + 2.338\alpha^{-\frac{1}{3}}$ is obtained from the analytical solution of the pullback attractor. For a very slowly changing $p(t)$, $\alpha \gg 1$ and $t^* = \hat{t} = 1$. This is the autonomous system with a tipping point.

that we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}^2 u}{\mathrm{d}t^2} = \alpha(1-t)u. \tag{24}$$

Eq. 24 is related to the Airy equation, and can be solved in terms of Airy functions. We are interested in its solution with initial values $u(t_0) = 1$ and $\frac{\mathrm{d}u(t_0)}{\mathrm{d}t} = x_0$.

The general solution to Eq. 24 is

$$u(t) = \Big[C_1 \mathrm{Ai}(z) + C_2 \mathrm{Bi}(z)\Big]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t)}, \tag{25}$$

where $C_{1,2}$ are two constants, and

$$\mathrm{Ai}(z) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \cos\left(\frac{\xi^3}{3} + z\xi\right)\mathrm{d}\xi, \tag{26a}$$

$$\mathrm{Bi}(z) = \frac{1}{\pi}\int_0^\infty \left[\exp\left(-\frac{\xi^3}{3} + z\xi\right) + \sin\left(\frac{\xi^3}{3} + z\xi\right)\right]\mathrm{d}\xi. \tag{26b}$$

Then,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u(t)}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\sqrt[3]{\alpha}\left[C_1\frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} + C_2\frac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}\right]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t)}, \tag{27}$$

and the solution to Eq. 23 is

$$x(t) = -\sqrt[3]{\alpha}\left[\frac{C_1\dfrac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} + C_2\dfrac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}}{C_1\mathrm{Ai}(z) + C_2\mathrm{Bi}(z)}\right]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t)}, \tag{28}$$

with the constants

$$C_1(t_0) = \left[\frac{\frac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} + \frac{x_0}{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}}\mathrm{Bi}(z)}{\mathrm{Ai}(z)\frac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} - \mathrm{Bi}(z)\frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}}\right]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t_0)}, \tag{29a}$$

$$C_2(t_0) = \left[\frac{-\frac{x_0}{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}}\mathrm{Ai}(z) - \frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}}{\mathrm{Ai}(z)\frac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} - \mathrm{Bi}(z)\frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}}\right]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t_0)}. \tag{29b}$$

The pullback attractor is obtained when $t_0 \to -\infty$. Since $\mathrm{Ai}(z) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Bi}(z) \to +\infty$ as $z \to +\infty$, we have

$$\lim_{t_0\to-\infty}\left(\frac{C_2(t_0)}{C_1(t_0)}\right) = \lim_{z\to+\infty}\left(\frac{-\frac{x_0}{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}}\mathrm{Ai}(z) - \frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}}{\frac{\mathrm{dBi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z} + \frac{x_0}{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}}\mathrm{Bi}(z)}\right) = 0. \tag{30}$$

$$\varphi_{pb}(t) = -\left[\frac{\sqrt[3]{\alpha}}{\mathrm{Ai}(z)}\frac{\mathrm{dAi}(z)}{\mathrm{d}z}\right]_{z=\sqrt[3]{\alpha}(1-t)}. \tag{31}$$

The denominator $\mathrm{Ai}(z)$ vanishes when $z \approx -2.338$, corresponding to the asymptote where $\varphi_{pb} \to -\infty$. Hence the time of no return is given by $t^* \approx 1+2.338\alpha^{-\frac{1}{3}}$: in other words, once the system breaks at $\hat{t} = 1$, the amount of time it takes for the system to reach the point of no return and fully tip (*i.e.*, $t^* - \hat{t}$) scales according to α (see Fig. 5).

If V is very small, then α is very large, and $t^* \simeq 1$, and the corresponding autonomous system is recovered.

4 Discussion

The importance of the relation $t^* > \hat{t}$ is that it reveals that for a changing environment which has just undergone a fundamental change, there remains an interval



Figure 5: The left dashed curve is $-\frac{1}{\mathrm{Ai}(-z)}\frac{\mathrm{dAi}(-z)}{\mathrm{d}z}$ as function of z. The solid curve crosses the horizontal axis at $z = 1.02$ since $\mathrm{Ai}(-1.02)$ is a local maximum of the Airy function. It has an asymptote (vertical dashed line) at $z = 2.34$ since $\mathrm{Ai}(-2.34) = 0$. The dashed parabola represents $\pm\sqrt{-z}$. Note that the solid line asymptotically approaches to the vertical dashed line since $\mathrm{Ai}(x) \sim \frac{1}{2}\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}}x^{-\frac{1}{4}}e^{-\frac{2}{3}x^{3/2}}$ as $x \to \infty$ [27]. Thus, the solid line goes as $\sqrt{-z} - (4z)^{-1}$ when $z \to -\infty$.

of time $(\hat{t}, t^*)$ during which the system can be saved from reaching the asymptotically different state if the changes to the environment are rapidly reversed. In other words, as long as the point of no return has not yet been reached, the system is still in theory salvageable. This has potential significance in the management of tipping point phenomena, since it provides a way to quantify and estimate the window of time after a significant environment change during which it is still possible to prevent the system from fully tipping.

A simple example in biology is given by the relationship between many animal population densities and the per capita growth rate of the population—specifically, the *strong Allee effect* describes how the per capita growth rate of some populations is maximal at some intermediate density and negative at low densities. Thus, for a laboratory experiment involving, for example, yeast, one could map the bi-

furcation diagram of per capita growth rate (the state variable) vs. a changing population density (the parameter) by performing regular dilutions on the populations (as done experimentally by Dai *et. al* [19]). Then as the dilution factor is increased, the system passes its *breaking point* at the exact time when the population density decreases beyond the critical point where the instantaneous per capita growth rate is no longer sufficient to maintain the population, and the system begins to crash.

However, *it is still salvageable*, as the point of no return (the time at which the entire population has died off) has not yet been reached. Indeed, if the environment change is rapidly reversed by adding a sufficient number of additional yeast cells into the system, then the population can be saved, and the per capita growth rate will recover. It is easy to imagine using similar models to track and estimate this time frame of salvageability for phenomena such as collapsing fish stocks due to overfishing.

With regard to tipping points in climate science, it has been established that tipping points in general can be further classified into several categories. In particular, in [28], Ashwin *et. al* suggested that critical transitions associated with tipping points can be classified into the following categories:

- "bifurcation-induced tipping" (*B-tipping*), in which the critical transition is directly associated with slow passage through a bifurcation [29],
- "noise-induced tipping" (*N-tipping*), in which stochastic effects result in the system leaving basins of attraction,
- and "rate-dependent tipping" (*R-tipping*), in which the system changes too slowly to track a changing attractor.

In the context of climate science terminology, then, our model is an simple example of B-tipping where the parameter change is not necessarily slow, and is one which affords an exact solution to the amount of time it takes for a system to fully tip from a previously tracked equilibrium to a new, asymptotically located state. A similar class of systems involving "parameter shifts" in non-autonomous systems is explored in a more mathematical formal way in [22]. What follows is an example application of our model to a simple climate model.

4.1 Breaking time and the point of no return in a simple climate model with B-Tipping

We end with a brief example of the application of our model to the Fraedrich energy-balance model [30] from climate science (see [28] for an excellent discussion of examples of other types of tipping which can occur in this system, or [22] for a description of parameter shifts and R-tipping in this system).

The model introduced by Fraedrich describes the evolution of the global mean surface temperature of an ocean-covered spherical planet subjected to radiative heating; it also takes into account ice-albedo and greenhouse feedback. This model, where T, the mean temperature, is the state variable, is given by

$$c\frac{\mathrm{d}T}{\mathrm{d}t} = R\downarrow - R\uparrow, \tag{32}$$

where $R\downarrow$ and $R\uparrow$ represent the incoming and outgoing radiation respectively and are given in terms of physical parameters:

$$R\downarrow = \frac{1}{4}\mu I_0(1-\alpha_p) \qquad R\uparrow = \epsilon_{sa}\sigma T^4, \tag{33}$$

where I_0 is the solar constant, $c > 0$ is the thermal inertia of the ocean, α_p is the planetary albedo, ϵ_{sa} is the effective emissivity, and μ is an external parameter which allows for variations in the solar constant or for long-term variations in planetary orbit. Now, consider a planet whose albedo-temperature relation's slope is negligible, and whose albedo increases (due to some unrelated cause) at a constant rate γ in time. Then the planetary albedo is given by

$$\alpha_p(t) = \gamma t \tag{34}$$

Then, Eq. 32 can be written as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}T}{\mathrm{d}t} = -aT^4 + b - b\gamma t, \tag{35}$$

where

$$a \equiv \frac{\epsilon_{sa}\sigma}{c} \qquad b \equiv \frac{I_0\mu}{4c}. \tag{36}$$

Note that $a > 0$. Then by introducing a transformed variable $W \equiv T^2$, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}W}{\mathrm{d}t} = 2T\frac{\mathrm{d}T}{\mathrm{d}t} = 2(-aW^2 + b - b\gamma t)\sqrt{W}. \tag{37}$$

Presuming that we are bounded away from domains that might cause existence problems, Eq. 37 is bifurcation-equivalent to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}W}{\mathrm{d}t} = -aW^2 + b - b\gamma t, \tag{38}$$

which is in the form of our model, Eq. 20, from which the breaking time and the point of no return for the system can be calculated. Physically, the breaking time corresponds to the point at which the planet's ocean's environment can no longer support a stable, "interglacial" state, and the point of no return corresponds to the point at which the ocean reaches an irreversible "deep freeze".

References

[1] S. H. Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications To Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering*. Westview Press, Boulder, 2001.

[2] L. Perko. *Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*. Springer, New York, 3rd edition, 2006.

[3] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical Biology: I. An Introduction*. Springer, New York, 3rd edition, 2007.

[4] H. Qian. Cooperativity in cellular biochemical processes: Noise-enhanced sensitivity, fluctuating enzyme, bistability with nonlinear feedback, and other mechanisms for sigmoidal responses. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.*, 41:179–204, 2012.

[5] S. Huang. Systems biology of stem cells: Three useful perspectives to help overcome the paradigm of linear pathways. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 366:2247–2259, 2011.

[6] S. Huang. Tumor progression: Chance and necessity in Darwinian and Lamarckian somatic (mutationless) evolution. *Progr. Biophys. Mol. Biol.*, 110:69–86, 2012.

[7] G. Nicolis. *Introduction to Nonlinear Science*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[8] Yuri A Kuznetsov. *Elements of Applied Bifurcation Theory*, volume 112. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[9] P. Ao, H. Qian, Y. Tu, and J. Wang. A theory of mesoscopic phenomena: Time scales, emergent unpredictability, symmetry breaking and dynamics across different levels. *arXiv:1310.5585.*, 2013.

[10] H. Qian. From discrete protein kinetics to continuous brownian dynamics: A new perspective (review). *Protein Science*, 11:1–5, 2002.

[11] H. Ge, H. Qian, and X. Sunney Xie. Stochastic phenotype transition of a single cell in an intermediate region of gene state switching. *Phys. Rev. Letters*, 114(7), 2015.

[12] M. Kot. *Elements of Mathematical Ecology*. Cambridge Univ. Press, U.K., 2001.

[13] F. Capra. *The Turning Point: Science, Society, and the Rising Culture*. Bantam; New York., 1984.

[14] C. Kuehn. A mathematical framework for critical transitions: Bifurcations, fast–slow systems and stochastic dynamics. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 240(12):1020–1035, 2011.

[15] M. Scheffer, J. Bascompte, W. A. Brock, V. Brovkin, S. R. Carpenter, V. Dakos, H. Held, E. H. van Nes, M. Rietkerk, and G. Sugihara. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461:53–59, 2009.

[16] Hodge J. W., Ardiani A., B. Farsaci, A. R. Kwilas, and S. R. Gameiro. The tipping point for combination therapy: Cancer vaccines with radiation, chemotherapy, or targeted small molecule inhibitors. *Semin. Oncol.*, 39:323–339, 2012.

[17] P. A. Jones. At the tipping point for epigenetic therapies in cancer. *J. Clin. Invest.*, 124:14–16, 2014.

[18] L. Chen, R. Liu, Z.-P. Liu, M. Li, and K. Aihara. Detecting early-warning signals for sudden deterioration of complex diseases by dynamical network biomarkers. *Scientific Rep.*, 2(342), 2012.

[19] L. Dai, D. Vorselen, K. S. Korolev, and J. Gore. Generic indicators for loss of resilience before a tipping point leading to population collapse. *Science*, 336:1175–1177, 2012.

[20] É. Plagányi, N. Ellis, L. Blamey, E. Morello, A. Norman-Lopez, W. Robinson, M. Sporcic, and H. Sweatman. Ecosystem modelling provides clues to understanding ecological tipping points. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*, 512:99–113, 2014.

[21] T. Schelling. Dynamic models of segregation. *J. Math. Soc.*, 1:143–186, 1971.

[22] P. Ashwin, C. Perryman, and S. Wieczorek. Parameter shifts for nonautonomous systems in low dimension: Bifurcation- and Rate-induced tipping. *arXiv:1506.07734*, June 2015.

[23] P. E. Kloeden and M. Rasmussen. *Nonautonomous Dynamical Systems*. AMS Pub., Providence, RI., 2011.

[24] P. E. Kloeden and C. Pötzsche. *Nonautonomous Dynamical Systems in the Life Sciences*. Springer, 2013.

[25] C. Kuehn. Scaling of saddle-node bifurcations: degeneracies and rapid quantitative changes. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 42(4):045101, 2009.

[26] W. A. Catterall, I. M. Raman, H. P. C. Robinson, T. J. Sejnowski, and O. Paulsen. The hodgkin-huxley heritage: from channels to circuits. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32, 2012.

[27] C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag. *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers*. McGraw-Hill, New York., 1978.

[28] P. Ashwin, S. Wieczorek, R. Vitolo, and P. Cox. Tipping points in open systems: bifurcation, noise-induced and rate-dependent examples in the climate system. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 370(1962):1166–1184, 2012.

[29] P. Ritchie and J. Sieber. Early-warning indicators for rate-induced tipping. *arXiv:1509.01696*, September 2015.

[30] K. Fraedrich. Catastrophes and resilience of a zero-dimensional climate system with ice-albedo and greenhouse feedback. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 105(443):147–167, 1979.